DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 322 CS 501 353

AUTHOR Pieweger, Margaret; Yerby, Janet
TITLE Values and Behavior Skills as Variables in Interpersonal Communication Instruction.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Portland, Oregon, Arpil 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Behavioral Science Research; College Students; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Educational Planning; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Competence; *Personal Values; Socialization; Social Relations; *Social Values

ABSTRACT

This study examines interpersonal competence in the context of educational values--those implicit in the course and those carried into the course by the students. The subjects were 450 students enrolled in the introductory interpersonal communication course at Cleveland State University (Ohio) during the spring of 1975. The questions posed are: Can interpersonal competence dimensions be extracted from a series of behavior descriptions or scales? Is there a relationship between a student's ratings on a set of behavior scales and the grade the student receives in the course? It was found that there is a relationship between a student's behavioral assessment and his or her performance in the course, and it was also revealed that the more congruent a student's value-orientation is with that of the course philosophy the greater will be the student's chance of performing well in the course. The major conclusion of this study is that there is a greater need for applying social science research methods to the practical problems of course development. (The results of this study are presented in both narrative and table form.) (RB)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED122322

# VALUES AND BEHAVIOR SKILLS AS VARIABLES IN INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION INSTRUCTION

Margaret Fieweger
Janet Yerby
Department of Communication
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret Fieweger

Janet Yerby

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Presented at the International Communication Association
Portland, Oregon, April 1976

CS 501 353

# VALUES AND BEHAVIOR SKILLS AS VARIABLES IN INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION INSTRUCTION

## DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM

Much of the current literature in speech communication instruction includes proposals advocating instructional models and strategies for adopting interpersonal communication as the introductory course in the speech communication curriculum.[1] Whether such courses emerge from a sound academic framework or are products of hurried responses to a desire to shift the focus of introductory courses from the public speaking setting to the broader context of reciprocal social interaction is likely to influence their success. This study is part of an ongoing series of research projects at Cleveland State University intended to treat this issue.

These projects, including the research described in this paper, have been based on the assertion that a systems-oriented approach to instructional research should be an integral part of the design of the course. Attendant upon applying the systems-framework are some significant axioms pertaining to the sequence of curriculum development which have evolved with the progress of the research program. The first of these maintains that any program of curriculum development should include a delineation of the philosophical and conceptual basis for the learning program. It is our contention that the design of the course, including

specific instructional strategies, should emerge from that theoretical foundation. The next sequence of course design includes developing and implementing desired instructional strategies. Implementation should include the following processes: a description of desired learning outcomes, an assessment of learner abilities and experiences relevant to learning objectives, and implementation of instructional procedures. Evaluation of the instructional process, which functions as feedback into the system so that necessary improvements and changes can be made, should be undertaken as an ongoing process of the course design. Inherent in this model is the assertion that decisions which are outcomes of instructional choices should be grounded in research and data collection. Research based on course evaluation should also be made available to course designers at other institutions for criticism and feedback. Appropriate modifications can then be made in the conceptual framework of the course, in the course design, in specific instructional strategies, and/or in the research questions and methodologies aimed at instructional evaluation.

Previous research by Bochner and Kelly has provided the conceptual framework for the introductory course at Cleveland State University. Bochner and Kelly utilize White's notion of competence motivation as the basis for their design of an instructional program in interpersonal skills.[2] The Bochner and Kelly model integrates cognitive and experiential dimensions of learning in interpersonal

competence. The cognitive dimension is concerned with learner's understanding of interpersonal communication processes. Such learning, as implemented in the course instruction, is assessed by performance on written examinations covering interpersonal communication concepts. Experiential learning, as implemented in the course design, is measured by evaluation of the student's skills in mastering various dimensions of interpersonal competence. Cognitive learning occurs in a lecture setting while experiential learning occurs in a small-group interaction setting. A significant component of the course includes the use of trained undergraduates as peer-facilitators. These facilitators are selected according to a specific set of advertised criteria, participate in a facilitator's workshop prior to each quarter, and attend weekly training sessions.

Research subsequent to Bochner and Kelly's theoretical article has since been reported. Yerby and Bochner conducted an initial evaluation of the course to determine some of the factors which significantly affected learning of students enrolled in the course.[3] Their research justified a course design based on cognitive and experiential components. They found that factors relating to the cognitive dimensions of learning were independent of, and different from, the factors relating to the behavior skills dimension. Performance in the interpersonal skills dimension of the course was significantly related to the student's perception of the group leader's empathy, the learner's perceptions of

their group's effectiveness, the learner's sex and class status, the learner's GPA, and the learner's interpersonal competence as perceived by other members of their small group. The best predictors of a student's test scores were the student's GPA, his/her class standing, and his/her degree of flexibility/acceptance skills as perceived by other group members.

In the study reported in this paper, the authors were interested in examining an additional variable responsible for learning. Because the course treats interpersonal perceptions and behaviors, it is important to identify the relationship of the value-orientations of students to their performance in the course. The course makes some prescriptions about the differences between functional and dysfunctional interpersonal behavior. The extent to which the value-orientations inherent in such prescriptions are congruent with a student's value-system could be related to his/her performance in the course. The first research question which this paper explores is: *What is the relationship between the degree to which a student's value-system is congruent with the values of the course and the student's grade in the course?*

The second issue the authors wished to explore is related specifically to the experiential component of the course. The student's achievement in the experiential component of the course is reflected in his/her laboratory grade. Instructors assign laboratory grades on the basis of

data collected by the peer-facilitators. Each student receives laboratory points based on his/her skills achievement on five dimensions of interpersonal competence: owning feelings, giving and receiving descriptive feedback, empathic listening, appropriate self-disclosure, and behavioral flexibility. Attendance and communication logs are also part of the group grade. An understanding of the five skills is communicated to the students through lecture and to the peer-facilitators through their training program. Essentially, the concepts are explained by describing the specific behaviors which are associated with each one. For instance, when owning feelings, students are encouraged to make first-person statements ("I am _____; I feel _____") rather than third-person statements ("You make me _____; you are _____"). A statement such as "I feel uncomfortable when you remain silent for a long time" is preferred over a statement such as "You are too quiet."

Those working in the course need empirical validation that the specific behaviors associated with interpersonal competence can be subsumed under the five dimensions described by the competence theory. Then a more formal delineation of the specific behaviors associated with each competence dimension can be made.

The measure in the Yerby and Bochner study used to gather data relevant to a student's level of interpersonal competence skill was the Group Assessment of Interpersonal Traits (GAIT) developed by Goodman and later refined by

D'Augelli.[4] The advantage of using the GAIT for research purposes is that it has been tested for reliability and validity and is unobtrusive. It is not very useful, however, as an evaluating measure to determine a student's grade in the course.

The purpose of the present study is to determine whether behaviors as described by the course instruction can be developed into a standard measure of a student's interpersonal competence. Such a measure would enable instructors to improve course grading and evaluation. The basic assumption is that the tests of rigor applied to an instrument used in a research project can be incorporated into the course instruction as an evaluation instrument.

To explore the problem described above, the following research questions were posed: *Can interpersonal competence dimensions be extracted from a series of behavior descriptions or scales? Is there a relationship between a student's ratings on a set of behavior scales and the grade he receives in the course?*

## EDUCATIONAL THEORY

This study is an attempt to examine interpersonal competence in the context of educational values--those implicit in the course and those carried into the course by the students. Seaberg contends that the goals or objectives of teachers must emerge from a belief system about people

and that teachers' roles must be congruent with their goals.[5] Teachers unaware of or ambivalent in their beliefs may confuse those they wish to teach. In giving a clear picture of his objectives, a teacher needs to clarify his beliefs about people and his beliefs about how they grow.

A teacher's value system will depend on his interpretation of human behavior. Historically American education has been characterized by three different approaches toward student growth: Freudian, behavioristic, and humanistic. Freudian theorists hold that a man's unconscious mind influences his behavior as well as his instincts and drives.[6] This viewpoint lifts responsibility for his behavior from the learner because he is controlled by his drives. Behaviorism is also deterministic in viewing the nature of man. Man's behavior is developed through conditioning, that is, behavior is shaped by external, environmental influences.[7] Humanistic educational theory moves beyond determinism and looks at behavior as affected by man's phenomenological view, the external environment together with the activating organism.[8] These theorists blend existential philosophy, phenomenology and humanistic psychology and focus on the learners themselves, their needs, their achievements, and their successes.

Clearly, the educational objectives of the teachers who are Freudian in philosophy will differ significantly from the objectives of teachers who are following a more humanistic philosophy. The educational objectives of

teachers will be either implicitly or explicitly value-laden, regardless which philosophy they espouse. For instance, the Bochner and Kelly model for teaching interpersonal communication draws heavily from the humanistic psychologists.

What Seaberg suggests is an investigation of the teacher's beliefs about students and the way they learn. How do a teacher's values influence the program of instruction? How are values articulated in the course design? What behaviors expected of the student are value-laden? Should students with value orientations incongruent with course design be given different options for course objectives than students whose values are congruent? Does participation in behavioral experiences of the course have any effect upon student values, i.e., strengthening values, changing values?

Raths, Harmin and Simon indicate that research on the effectiveness of the various approaches to value education is lacking.[9] Researchers have not agreed on the goals for value education, especially on the balance between value indoctrination and value clarification. They need better measuring instruments, especially to identify values which are woven into the behavior demands of their courses.

Increasingly, educational theorists look at values as components of the educational process.[10] Until educators can empirically document value changes in students because of course content, the question of the impact of value

education is unknown. Teachers should identify what values are implicitly and explicitly taught in their courses. When students' values are known to be congruent with instructional values, then the effects of this congruency can be studied.

The development of values is a personal and lifelong process. Nevertheless, the educator is accountable to his students for examining the values inherent in the course and for seeking cognitive and affective behavioral objectives that emphasize those values.

Interpersonal competence instruction has been separated into cognitive and experiential components. This distinction can be grounded within the framework of current educational theory. Brown called for "confluent" education, meaning education in which the affective and cognitive elements are integrated and flow together for the individual and the group.[11] Bloom and Krathwohl in their taxonomy of educational objectives separated learning into the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills.[12]

The Bloom and Krathwohl taxonomy is hierarchical. It assumes that each succeeding category involves behavior which is more complex and abstract than the one that preceded it. Psychomotor learning involves proficiency in physical skills or manual tasks. Cognitive learning involves knowledge acquisition (rote memory), comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation of information. Affective learning involves receiving, responding, valuing certain phenomena, organizing the value into a value

system, and finally acting with internal consistency according to that value. According to the Bloom and Krathwohl taxonomy, the experiential component of an interpersonal communication course, utilizing the design proposed in this research, is affective learning. Essentially the skills required of affective learning are behavioral in nature as are the interpersonal competence skills.

Measuring cognitive learning has been easier than measuring affective or experiential learning.[13] The central research problem posed by the affective domain is how to evaluate affective objectives with greater validity, reliability, and objectivity. If we can document in the interpersonal communication course what learning experiences produce what changes in the affective (as well as the cognitive) domain, we will be making a more holistic evaluation of the students' performances. When developing evaluation techniques used in such courses, teachers will be making the course objectives (those selected behaviors required of students) more explicit.

The primary tasks of the designer of a course in interpersonal communication are suggested by the Bloom and Krathwohl model: first, to define communication competence values; second, to measure students for congruence with that value set; and third, to identify behaviors to be taught in the experiential component of the interpersonal communication course. This research will attempt to discover how a student's value orientation affects his response to the

interpersonal competence skills and, ultimately, his performance in the course.

## METHOD

### Independent Variables

The instrument used to assess a student's achievement in interpersonal competence was composed of forty behavioral descriptions (e.g., "checks out his/her understanding of group members' meaning" or "speaks for other members of the group"). The items were developed from the content of the course which focuses on specific behaviors associated with owning feelings, giving and receiving concrete feedback, self-disclosure, empathic listening, and behavioral flexibility.

Group leaders functioning as trained observers rated each student in their groups according to the frequency with which the group member performed a specific behavior. A test to determine the reliability of raters was administered to the group leaders prior to their completing the behavior skills instrument. The reliability test consisted of a fictitious written dialogue between two group members. Group leaders were asked to rate the behaviors of the interactants in the interaction sequence, using a five point scale, on three competence dimensions: (1) owning feelings, (2) giving concrete feedback, and (3) empathic behavior. Since negative and positive items were included in the

instrument, negative statements were inverted so that scores on all the scales were coded in the same direction. Ratings were sufficiently correlated to support the claim that group leaders were reliable raters ($r = .93$).[14]

Subjects were 450 students enrolled in the introductory interpersonal communication course at Cleveland State University during the spring of 1975. Raters completed the instrument for each subject under controlled conditions at a group facilitator's meeting at the end of the quarter.

A factor analysis (principal factors, orthogonal rotation to simple structure) of the behavioral skills data revealed that the items were separated on two dimensions (see Table I).[15] The scales do not cluster according to the behavior categories described by the interpersonal competence theory. Instead, the first factor deals with a more general dimension of interpersonal communication which could be labeled *active involvement*. The statements are all positive statements focusing on various kinds of helping or facilitative communication. The second factor is composed of more negative behaviors, many of which deal with *dysfunctional speaking patterns* such as making lengthy speeches, speaking for others, being argumentative, interrupting, cutting off others, and evaluating others. Two of the items are not dysfunctional ("can be comfortable with silence" and "listens without interrupting") but are related to silent behavior. Within the context of the other negative

TABLE I

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF BEHAVIORAL SKILLS ITEMS

| Variable Item | Factor Loading |
|---|---|
| **Factor I: Active Involvement** | |
| **Percent of Variance: 32.23** | |
| 2. Checks out his/her understanding of group member's meaning. | .81 |
| 3. Initiates issues for the group to deal with. | .71 |
| 6. Establishes eye contact when spoken to. | .58 |
| 10. Is spontaneous in communicating with members in the group. | .72 |
| 11. Adapts to the level of intimacy of other group members. | .75 |
| 14. Seeks information from group members. | .81 |
| 19. Is flexible when interacting with other group members. | .83 |
| 20. Encourages others to share feelings. | .79 |
| 25. Mediates conflict. | .72 |
| 27. Helps others to get into the interaction. | .79 |
| 31. Can "hear" feelings as well as thoughts. | .70 |
| 32. Paraphrases at appropriate times. | .75 |
| 34. Directs all remarks to the facilitator. | .42 |
| 35. Can offer concrete feedback on negative things. | .76 |
| 38. Can offer concrete feedback on positive things. | .76 |
| 39. Can describe behavior specifically. | .77 |
| 40. Makes descriptive statements about the group's process. | .63 |
| **Factor II: Dysfunctional Speaking Patterns** | |
| **Percent of Variance: 12.16** | |
| 4. Speaks for other members of the group. | .61 |
| 7. Makes lengthy speeches in getting his/her messages across. | .65 |
| 8. Is argumentative with some members of the group. | .62 |
| 21. Can be comfortable with silence. | .45 |
| 30. Listens without interrupting. | .66 |
| 36. Cuts off other members when they are speaking. | .77 |
| 37. Uses evaluation when offering feedback. | .54 |
| **Percent of Total Variance: 44.39** | |

behaviors, the two items could be viewed as low-participant items and therefore be consistent with the general negative tone of the dimension.

The factor analysis of the behavior items did not empirically validate that the specific behaviors associated with interpersonal competence can be subsumed under the five dimensions described by the competence theory. One problem may have been the inclusion of both negative and positive behavior descriptions in the instrument. Instead of revealing dimensions of interpersonal competence, the factor analysis tended to distinguish competent behaviors from incompetent behaviors. The raters, who were group facilitators, may have made distinctions between effective and ineffective group members on the basis of gross characteristics such as participation, involvement, and negative behaviors. The dimensions tend to be more general than those of the competence theory rather than an entirely different set of clusters. This gives the authors some encouragement that with additional instrumentation development more dimensions may emerge.

The instrument used to assess a student's value-orientation was composed of a series of sixty-five Likert-type statements relevant to the value-system suggested by the course philosophy. Each student was instructed to indicate the extent of agreement with the statement. The scales dealt with such issues as one's preference for manipulation of others, impression management, open expression

of feelings, democratic versus authoritarian work climates, and general cynicism toward others and life. Scales which appeared relevant to the value-orientation of the course were extracted from several widely known theories.[16] In addition, statements relevant to assertions made in the course instruction, either explicitly or implicitly, were included.

Subjects were 474 students enrolled in the introductory interpersonal communication course at Cleveland State University during the spring and summer of 1975. Students were administered the instrument during a required class period near the end of the quarter. Negative statements were inverted so that scores on all the scales were coded in the same direction.

A factor analysis (principal factors, orthogonal rotation to simple structure) revealed three dimensions of value-orientation (see Table II). The first factor is composed of a cluster of positive statements (with one exception) dealing with open and honest expression of feelings, openness to change, concern for others' feelings, and acceptance of differences between people. The authors labeled this factor *openness and acceptance of self and others*. Items loading on the second factor were negatively associated with the values suggested by the course philosophy. The items reflected a distrust in spontaneity and a trust in impression management. They tended to be more consistent with traditional methods of dealing with interpersonal

TABLE II

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF VALUE-ORIENTATION ITEMS

| Variable Item | Factor Loading |
|---|---|
| **Factor I: Openness and Acceptance of Self and Others** | |
| **Percent of Variance: 15.4** | |
| 3. People who express their feelings to others tend to be well adjusted. | .44 |
| 10. Taking risks in talking about yourself will be rewarded by deepening relationships with others. | .47 |
| 18. Leaders should be as concerned with personal relations as with getting the job done. | .36 |
| 27. When a person is troubled by a coming event, he/she should rehearse alternative ways of dealing with the event. | .37 |
| 28. If a person expresses fear, he is weak. | .41 |
| 29. Changing a decision may have positive results. | .47 |
| 35. If a person is to continue to grow, he/she should be open to new ideas and willing to change. | .62 |
| 39. Most work situations would improve if the people who are working together could be more honest about their feelings. | .41 |
| 40. A person who is concerned about the feelings of others will probably be more satisfied with his/her life. | .47 |
| 44. If we were better able to see things from another's point of view, there would be less pain in the world. | .60 |
| 45. In dealing with anyone, it is important to indicate a respect for that person as an individual. | .55 |
| **Factor II: Reliance on Social Convention** | |
| **Percent of Variance: 4.7** | |
| 5. Leaders should settle all conflicts in a work group. | .36 |
| 15. It is better to be tactful than to create a conflict. | .46 |
| 16. It is important to know one's place in an organization and not overstep it. | .50 |
| 30. Good manners and proper behavior are important things that a person must learn. | .50 |

TABLE II Cont'd.

| Variable Item | Factor Loading |
|---|---|
| 32. Your reputation is precious so you should do everything to protect it. | .49 |
| 62. It is a good working policy to keep on good terms with everyone. | .48 |
| Factor III: Control and Cynicism | |
| Percent of Variance: 2.3 | |
| 14. To advance in an organization, individuals will have to cause pain for others. | .48 |
| 22. Don't blame yourself for mistakes; other people will. | .42 |
| 26. Life is an endless series of problems without solution in sight. | .47 |
| 36. People generally don't want you to be honest with them. | .33 |
| 58. The biggest difference between criminals and other people is that criminals get caught. | .34 |
| 63. Most people don't know what is best for them. | .52 |
| Percent of Total Variance: 22.3 | |

problems such as being tactful, relying on good manners, concern for one's reputation, and depending on a leader to solve conflicts. We labeled the second factor *reliance on social convention*. The last factor was also composed of a series of negative items. These items, labeled *control and cynicism*, reflected a manipulative orientation toward people and a general cynicism toward others and life in general.

The value-system suggested by the course philosophy tends to be congruent with the three dimensions identified in the factor analysis: (a) an acceptance of one's and other's feelings and differences, (b) a distrust of the value of socially prescribed conventions, and (c) a positive orientation toward people and life in general.

Dependent Variable

Students' grades in the introductory course in interpersonal communication were the dependent measure used in the study. Each student's grade consisted of the following: a midterm exam with 50 possible points, a final exam with 50 possible points, and a rating on group participation with 50 possible points. The group rating consisted of weekly evaluations of communication logs and attendance at and participation in the small group sessions. The exams rated the cognitive learning of the students while the group grades rated the experiential learning of the students.

Research Design

To examine the relationship of behavioral skills and value-orientation to grade in the course a 2 x 2 factorial design was utilized. Behavior skills and value-orientation items were coded so that each subject could receive a total score on the factor analyzed items which revealed the extent to which his skills achievement and value-orientation were congruent with the course. Subjects (N = 132) scoring in either the top third or bottom third of both instruments were utilized in the study. The four cells in the study, then, constituted the following: (1) grades for Ss scoring *high* on behavior skills and *high* on value-orientation, (2) grades for Ss scoring *high* on behavior skills and *low* on value-orientation, (3) grades for Ss scoring *low* on behavior skills and *high* on value orientation, and (4) grades for Ss scoring *low* on behavior skills and *low* on value-orientation.

A two-way analysis of variance was performed on the data to determine whether either or both variables are causally related to grade in the course and whether there was an interaction effect between skill achievement and value-orientation.

## RESULTS

Analysis of variance yielded significant main effects for both independent variables. No interaction effect was found although there was a tendency toward

significance. Students who were rated high in behavioral skills ($\bar{x}$ = 121.2) scored significantly higher grades in the course than students who were rated lower in behavioral skills ($\bar{x}$ = 116.2). Likewise students who ranked higher in values ($\bar{x}$ = 123.5) scored significantly higher grades than students who ranked lower in values ($\bar{x}$ = 113.7) (see Table III).

## DISCUSSION

Finding that ratings by the group leaders on a series of behavioral skills were directly related to the student's overall grade in the course validates the course design which included cognitive and experiential components. There was a relationship between a student's behavioral assessment and his or her performance in the course. This finding gives support for experimenting with the behavioral instrument as an evaluation tool in the course. The use of the elaborated series of behavioral items as an evaluation instrument may provide the instructors and the students with a more precise description of what learning is being measured in the small group setting. The current method used in the course assigns points to group members on a more general basis. Whether or not behavior in the group setting should be graded at all is an issue often debated by instructors who have taught the course. This research lends support for the assertion that behavior skills are learned behaviors and can be measured.

TABLE III

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

| Source of Variance | DF | F | P < |
|---|---|---|---|
| A Behavioral Skills | 1 and 128 | 13.0392 | .0005 |
| B Values | 1 and 128 | 21.2780 | .0001 |
| AB Interaction | 1 and 128 | 3.1709 | .0774 |

At this time, the authors realize that further work is needed to refine the skills instrument. The two factors derived initially, active involvement and dysfunctional speaking patterns, do not differentiate clearly the five behavioral skills that the course emphasizes. If the instrument is refined so that five factors related to the five skills emerge, the instrument will be a more objective method of rating student performance in the small group setting than the form that is presently being used in the course.

The study also revealed that the more congruent a student's value-orientation is with that of the course philosophy the greater will be his or her chance of performing well in the course. This result indicates the importance of examining value-orientation as a significant variable in evaluating the design, content, and instrumentation of the course. This research suggests a potential usefulness in including a unit on values identification and clarification in the course. The problems of students whose values differ significantly from those of the course philosophy is surely an important issue which deserves the attention of the instructors involved in the course. Furthermore, the results of the study suggest that anyone who performs the role of a teacher may gain some insight into the learning process by examining the relationship of the values implied in his or her teaching method and content to student performance in the course. An instructor who is

oblivious to such an issue may run the risk of overlooking an important learning variable.

Since values of the students also have been shown to affect grades of the students, the values measure should be given at the beginning of the course and again at the end of the course to determine whether or not the course has had an effect upon the communication values of the students. This information will be useful for instructors who are evaluating the course design and objectives.

The ultimate purpose of this research is to develop instruments which can be used to assess student performance in the course as well as instruments useful in gathering data relevant to the planning and the design components of the course. The instruments used in this study need to be analyzed further and the design of the study needs to be replicated before they are useful to other teachers of interpersonal communication.

One of the major positions taken in this study is that there is a greater need for applying social science research methods to the practical problems of course development. Too often research is conducted in controlled environments and shared among interested researchers, while instruction problems are left to the good intentions and educated intuitions of teachers who make little effort to apply research methods to the practical problems of course development.

FOOTNOTES

[1]See, for instance, John Stewart, "An Interpersonal Approach to the Basic Course," *Speech Teacher*, 21 (January 1972), p. 7; R. S. Mehrley and J. G. Backes, "The First Course in Speech: A Call for Revolution," *Speech Teacher*, 21 (September 1972), 205-211; and G. D'Angelo and J. Nyquist, "Teaching Strategies for Large Lecture Courses: Use of Multimedia and Discussion Groups," *Speech Teacher*, 22 (November 1973), 310-317.

[2]Arthur P. Bochner and Clifford W. Kelly, "Interpersonal Competence: Rationale, Philosophy and Implementation of the Conceptual Framework," *Speech Teacher*, 23 (November 1974), 279-301.

[3]J. Yerby and A. P. Bochner, "Factors Affecting Learning in an Interpersonal Communication Course: An Evaluation Study," Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Chicago, April 1975.

[4]G. Goodman, "Systematic Selection of Psychotherapeutic Talent: Group Assessment of Interpersonal Traits," in *Handbook of Community Mental Health*, eds. S. Golann and R. Eisdorfer, 939-954; A. R. D'Augelli, "Group Composition Using Interpersonal Skills: An Analogue Study of the Effects of Members' Interpersonal Skills on Peer Ratings and Group Cohesiveness," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 20 (1973), 531-534; A. R. D'Augelli, J. M. Chinsky and H. Getter, "The Effect of Group Composition and Duration on Sensitivity Training," *Small Group Behavior*, 5 (1974), 56-64. The instrument consists of eight statements descriptive of several ways in which a person's behavior may have been experienced by the group, e.g., "I see him as a relaxed, easy going person."

[5]D. I. Seaberg, *The Four Faces of Teaching: The Role of the Teacher in Humanizing Education* (Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1974), p. 9.

[6]S. Freud, *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*, ed. A. A. Brill (New York: Random House, 1938).

[7]J. B. Watson, *Behaviorism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930). B. F. Skinner, *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* (New York: Knopf, 1971).

[8]A. Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1962); C. R. Rogers, *Freedom to Learn* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969); R. May, *Man's Search for Himself* (New York: New American Library, 1953); E. Fromm, *Man for Himself* (Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publishing, 1947); A. W. Combs and C. Syngg, *Individual Behavior: A Perceptual Approach to Behavior* (New York: Harper and Row, 1959); and W. W. Purkey, *Self Concept and School Achievement* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970).

[9]L. E. Raths, M. Harmin, and S. B. Simon, *Values and Teaching* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966).

[10]H. Kirschenbaum and S. B. Simon, eds., *Readings in Values Clarification* (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973).

[11]G. I. Brown, Human Teaching for *Human Learning: An Introduction to Confluent Education* (New York: The Viking Press, 1971).

[12]B. S. Bloom, M. D. Englehart, E. J. Furst, W. H. Hill, and D. R. Krathwohl, *A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I, The Cognitive Domain* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956); D. R. Krathwohl, B. S. Bloom, and B. Masia, *A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II, The Affective Domain* (New York: David McKay and Co., 1964); and R. J. Kibler, L. L. Barker, and D. T. Miles, *Behavioral Objectives and Instruction* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970), 21. Kibler, Barker, and Miles use Bloom and Krathwohl's taxonomy as the theoretical basis for discussion behavioral objectives.

[13]Testing cognitive objectives is not precise, but the art of testing is far more fully developed in the cognitive domain than in the affective domain. D. R. Krathwohl, B. S. Bloom, and B. Masia, *op. cit.*, 87.

[14]An analysis of variance procedure was performed to derive these reliability coefficients of raters, see J. P. Guilford, *Psychometric Methods*, 2nd Ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954), Chapters 13, 14.

[15]For a rationale of the factor analysis performed see R. J. Rummel, *Applied Factor Analysis* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1970), p. 386. See *BMD: Biomedical Computer Programs, X-Series Supplement* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1970), for the specific computer program used in the factor analysis.

[16]Items were included from the following: R. Christie and F. Geis, *Studies in Machiavellianism* (New York: Academic Press, 1970); T. W. Adorno, *et al.*, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1969); D. McGregor, *The Human Side of Enterprise* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960); and H. Kirschenbaum and S. B. Simon, eds., *Readings in Values Clarification* (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973).